

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/770,643	01/26/2001	C. Alexander Turner JR.	LEX-0122-USA	9470	
24231	7590 02/19/2003				
LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED			EXAMINER		
8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160		•	LANDSMAN	LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1647		

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/770,643	TURNER ET AL.
riation, rional	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Robert Landsman	1647
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ition. A proper reply to a
	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the composes of the compose	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFF extension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mailing	R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension or the fee.
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	riod set forth in the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	better form for appeal by mater .	ially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelin NOTE:	g a corresponding number of fir	ally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	e allowable if submitted in a sep	parate, timely filed amendment.
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for rapplication in condition for allowance because: See	econsideration has been consid Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becarraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims wou	s) a) will not be entered or b) lald be rejected is provided below	will be entered and an or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		<u>.</u>
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	)☐ approved or b)☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•
0. Other:		
Patent and Trademark Office		<del>-</del>

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: though Applicants argue that the protein of the present invention is a caspr, and have provided post-filing references showing that the protein of the present invention is 99% identical to that of a caspr protein of Takeuchi et al. and that the functions of caspr proteins are well-known, Applicants have only alledged that the protein of the present invention is a caspr based on homology to neurexins and casprs (page 1, lines 1112 and page 2, lines 1-4 of the specification). Applicants have not provided any definitive evidence or statement concluding that the protein of the invention is, in fact, a caspr protein as opposed to another member of the neurexin family of proteins. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1-3 and 6-8 remain rejected under 35 USC 101 and 112, first pagragraph, for these reasons as well as for the reasons on pages 2-4 of the Final Rejection mailed 10/22/02.

SARY KUNZ SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMIN